REMARKS

Claims 1-33 and 39-68 are pending. Claims 34-38 are cancelled. Claims 1, 19, 39, 44, 48, 61, and 65 are independent.

The examiner uses Bhagavath and Sheth to reject claims 1-2, 7-8, 14-20, 25, 30-33, 39, 44-49, 53-54, 57-61, and 65-68 as having been obvious.

Claims 1, 19, 39, 44, 48, 61, and 65 recite "a preference file maintenance process for maintaining, for each said user, an advertisement preference file that specifies said predefined advertisement categories associated with each said monitored query entered by said user, thus generating a list of user-preferred advertisement categories," or similar language. Neither Bhagavath nor Sheth teaches or suggests at least this quoted feature.

Claims 1, 19, 39, 44, 48, 61, and 65 are not rendered obvious by Bhagavath in combination with ordinary skill in the art. Bhagavath teaches the use of network user profiles, including age, gender, and income information. (Bhagavath, paragraph 0047). Such profiles may allow network service providers to offer intelligent data caching, data prefetching, and investigation of network security breaches. (Bhagavath, paragraph 0004). Further, Bhagavath teaches a usage monitoring module that maintains an historical list of network addresses previously accessed by the user in a navigational sequence. (Bhagavath, paragraph 0064). Extended network usage monitoring may also include network domains accessed by the user. (Bhagavath, paragraph 0084-0085). Finally, Bhagavath indicates that network address and domain access statistics may be useful to advertisers (Bhagavath, paragraph 0085), specifically suggesting that the real-time interception of a network query string may allow an advertiser to return a targeted advertisement. (Bhagavath, paragraph 0067).

However, Bhagavath fails to teach or suggest the maintenance of a user preference file specifying predefined advertisement categories associated with each user. Moreover, Bhagavath no where teaches the monitoring of user queries over an extended period of time, as opposed to just a single query, to identify the particular areas of interest of a particular user. Bhagavath also fails to suggest that averaging may be used in concert with long-term monitoring of user queries to make an accurate determination of the user's current and shifting patterns of interest. Claims

2, 7-8, 14-18, 20, 25, 30-33, 45-49, 53-54, 57-60, and 66-68 depend upon, and further limit, claims 1, 19, 39, 44, 48, 61, and 65, and, accordingly, are not rendered obvious by Bhagavath.

The examiner also uses Sheth in combination with Bhagavath to reject claims 1, 19, 39, 44, 48, 61, and 65 as having been obvious.

Claims 1, 19, 39, 44, 48, 61, and 65 are not rendered obvious by Bhagavath and Sheth. Bhagavath, as discussed above, teaches the "monitoring [of] network usage at a network access point." (Bhagavath, Abstract). Sheth teaches a "system and method for creating a database of metadata (metabase) of a variety of digital media content, including TV and radio content delivered on the Internet." (Sheth, Abstract). Sheth suggests utilizing the words and context of a metabase search to profile users and target advertising. (Sheth, col. 15, lines 31-37). Specifically, Sheth teaches methods that can "instantaneously select and display commercial advertisements based on the semantic context that the Web user is currently browsing." (Sheth, col. 15, lines 53-56). Thus, Sheth fails to teach or suggest the ongoing maintenance of an advertisement preference file particularized to each user's historical interests. Claims 2, 7-8, 14-18, 20, 25, 30-33, 45-49, 53-54, 57-60, and 66-68 depend upon, and further limit, claims 1, 19, 39, 44, 48, 61, and 65, and, accordingly, are not rendered obvious by Bhagavath in combination with Sheth.

The examiner also uses Bhagavath to reject claims 19 and 39 as having been obvious.

Claim 19 recites "a query storage process for storing said monitored queries in an advertisement preference file for that said user." Bhagavath neither teaches nor suggests at least this quoted feature.

Claim 19 is not rendered obvious by Bhagavath in combination with ordinary skill in the art. As previously discussed, Bhagavath teaches some benefits of network usage monitoring, including the ability to create network user profiles. (Bhagavath, paragraphs 0004, 0047). Bhagavath also suggests that real-time monitoring of network user queries provides information beneficial to targeted advertising. (Bhagavath, paragraphs 0067). However, Bhagavath does not teach the storage of monitored queries for later processing to minimize server loading during peak search engine usage. Claims 20, 25, and 30-33 depend upon, and further limit, claim 19.

Accordingly, claims 20, 25, and 30-33 are not rendered obvious by Bhagavath in combination with ordinary skill in the art.

Claim 39 recites "an advertisement repository for storing a plurality of advertisements grouped in accordance with said predefined advertisement categories." Bhagavath neither teaches nor suggests at least this quoted feature.

Claim 39 is not rendered obvious by Bhagavath in combination with ordinary skill in the art. Just as the above cited Bhagavath paragraphs do not teach a query storage process, nor do they teach or suggest that advertisements, potentially corresponding to entries in an advertising preference file, be grouped in accordance with predefined advertisement categories and stored for later transmission.

The examiner also uses Sheth to reject claim 44 as having been obvious.

Claim 44 recites a "query association process...wherein said query association process includes a query parsing process for separating said query into one or more discrete chunks." Sheth neither teaches nor suggests at least this quoted feature.

Claim 44 is not rendered obvious by Sheth in combination with ordinary skill in the art. Sheth teaches the generation of a secondary query, based on an initial user query of the media assets within the metabase, to identify targeted advertising. (Sheth, col. 16, lines 12-17). However, Sheth does not teach the parsing of the user query into one or more discrete chunks prior to association with advertising media. Claims 45-47 depend upon, and further limit, claim 44. Accordingly, claims 45-47 are not rendered obvious by Sheth in combination with ordinary skill in the art.

The examiner uses Bhagavath and Sheth in view of Angles to reject claims 3-6, 9-13, 21-24, 26-29, 40-43, 50-52, 55-56, and 62-64 as having been obvious.

Claims 1, 19, 39, 44, 48, 61, and 65 are not rendered obvious by Bhagavath and Sheth in view of Angles. Angles teaches a method and system for delivering customized advertisements based on demographic and personal information manually entered by the user upon voluntary registration with the advertisement provider. (Angles, col. 3, lines 21-24; col. 17, lines 2-22). Angles neither teaches nor suggests the maintenance of an advertisement preference file based

upon long-term monitoring of user queries, rather than requisite user registration and data entry. Claims 3-6, 9-13, 21-24, 26-29, 40-43, 50-52, 55-56, and 62-64 depend upon, and further limit, claims 1, 19, 39, 44, 48, 61, and 65. Accordingly, claims 3-6, 9-13, 21-24, 26-29, 40-43, 50-52, 55-56, and 62-64 are not obviated by Bhagavath and Sheth in view of Angles.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Enclosed is a $120.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 1, 2005

Kenneth F. Kozik
Reg. No. 36,572

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21096859